8th November 1935]

(c) in the case of those absorbed into the district board service, their service, pay drawn while in taluk board service and that now fixed by the Government together with their qualifications;

(d) when the Government issued orders selecting clerks of ex-taluk boards to district board service;

(e) when appointments of such selected clerks were made by the President of South Arcot District Board; and

(f) whether any complaints have been received by the Government from any of the ex-taluk board employees in South Arcot district regarding their grievances for delay in appointing them?

A.—(a) The ministerial staff of the South Arcot District Board before the abolition of taluk boards was 55 excluding one manager of the District Board Office, another of the District Board Engineer's Office and an accountant. The strength of the staff after the abolition of taluk boards is sixty-nine which excludes one Secretary, two Superintendents, one Manager of the District Board Engineer's Office and one Accountant.

(b) The additional posts of clerks (14) sanctioned to the district board consequent upon the abolition of taluk boards were filled by the appointment of ex-taluk board clerks. Government have no information in regard to the number of ex-taluk board clerks still left unabsorbed.

(c) Government do not consider that any useful purpose will be served by furnishing a statement of these particulars.

(d) The orders of Government are dated the 28th May 1934 and 28th August 1934.

(e) Government have no information.

(f) No.

Irrigation

Disposal of the buildings at Mettur.

* 504 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what the Government have done with their buildings at Mettur;

(b) how many have been sold in auction, what the amount fetched by them is and what the original cost of constructing them was;

(c) whether it is a fact that the buildings constructed for the occupation of upper and lower division clerks cannot endure to stand long since they are not of strong structure;

(d) if so, what the Government propose to do with them; and

[8th November 1935

(e) of all the buildings at Mettur, how many are of a substantial nature, what they are and what the original cost of constructing them was?

A.—(a) & (b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clauses (e), (f) and (g) of question No. 467, dated 23rd January 1935, and the statement which was furnished to him on 12th March 1935, with reference to the answer given to the supplementary question No. 844 of the same date. Later information is not available with Government. Such of the buildings as are vacant after the requirements of Government have been met will be sold or let out on rent to private persons if there is a demand for them.

(c) The buildings were intended to be only of a temporary nature.

(d) These buildings also will be dealt with as indicated in the answer to clauses (a) and (b) above.

(e) There are 14 buildings costing between Rs. 5,000 and Rs. 10,000 and 15 costing above Rs. 10,000. Information as to what they are and what the capital cost of each is, is not available with Government.

Interest realized on the capital outlay on the Cauvery Delta system.

* 505 Q.—Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what is the total capital expenditure on the Cauvery Delta system; and

(b) what interest they expected to derive on the capital invested and what interest they are now actually getting?

A.—(a) Rs. 78,41,754 to the end of 1933–34.

(b) It is impossible to say what return was originally expected on the capital invested as the construction estimates of the Cauvery Delta Works were not accompanied by forecast statements and though these construction estimates were closed important works have been sanctioned from time to time and expenditure of a capital nature is incurred every year. The return for 1933–34 was 10.7 per cent on the total capital outlay.

Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari:—"May I know if the Hon. Member will try to give us the information about the original scheme and what rate of interest they expected on it so that the House may know what rate the Government are actually collecting on the Cauvery-Mettur Project and people may know, whenever additional taxation is imposed, whether the present rate is much greater than what it was?"